

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/516,708	Applicant(s) MAURER, MAX M.
	Examiner William D. Thomson	Art Unit 2123

All Participants: Status of Application: _____

(1) William D. Thomson. (3) _____.

(2) Ralph Hoppin. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 October 2004 Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102 rejections outstanding against claims 1-22, especially claim 3

Claims discussed:

1-22

Prior art documents discussed:

prior art asserted in the FAOM, Gessel, Chen, Eckes, Kram, Swetman, and Somasegar

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon careful review of the prior art in combination with arguments presented in the response dated June 16, 2004, examiner noted that the prior art asserted did not expressly teach the applicant's claimed limitations as recited in claim 3, and disclosed within their specification, specific to the formulating and padding operation as taught therein. Applicant's representative and the examiner have agreed to make amendments as follows:

The examiner will provide an amendment to claims 1, 15, and 22 that brings the language of claim 3 into each of these independent claims. Claims 3 and 7 will be cancelled. Dependencies will be corrected for claims 8, 9 and 10 to depend on claim 1, instead of claim 3..